REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed July 21, 2011. Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Before turning to the substance of this Amendment and the Office Action, it is noted that the Assignee of the subject application has re-assigned the subject application to the undersigned attorney for prosecution. The undersigned attorney wishes to express his desire to work collaboratively with the Examiner to advance the prosecution of this application.

The Abstract has been cancelled and replaced with a new Abstract to overcome the Examiner's objections. Claims 1-60 have been cancelled. New claims 61-76 have been added. It is believed that the changes that have been made to the claims render moot the Examiner's §112, second paragraph, rejection (see Office Action, pages 2-3). The changes made to the claims find support at, inter alia, page 4, line 12 to page 12, line 21 of the Specification, and in Figures 1-3 of the subject application.

In making the within claim amendments, Applicants are clarifying the claimed subject matter and are not acquiescing as to the validity and/or correctness of (1) the rejections of the subject application, or (2) the characterizations of the art made by the Examiner in the Office Action. The within claim amendments are not intended to, and do not result in disclaimer, waiver, and/or estoppel vis-à-vis claim scope and/or equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 45-60 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allison (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,848) in view of Belkin (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,125). It is respectfully submitted that the newly added claims are patentable over this art combination.

All claim limitations must be considered material in judging the patentability of the claims against the prior art. MPEP §2143.03; *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976); *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494 (CCPA 1970). In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 USC §103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed combination of limitations, as a whole, would have been obvious. MPEP §2141.02; *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976). Rejections based on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with factual rationale to

support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In order for that reasoning and rationale to be proper, among other things, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested in the art relied upon by the Examiner. MPEP §2141 III; *KSR International v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___ , 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Even assuming, arguendo, that the Examiner's statements in the Office Action concerning Allison and Belkin are correct, nothing in these documents can be said to disclose or suggest the features of Applicants' newly added claims. For example, new independent claim 61 recites:

> assigning received packets to threads for processing, the threads to be executed by microengines in the processor, each respective microengine to employ respective local event signals and global signaling states, the respective local event signals being local to respective threads executed by the respective microengine and being to provide information on whether functions requested by the respective threads have completed, the global signaling states permitting an executing thread signal state to be broadcast to the microengines, the threads executed by the microengines being able to branch based on the global signaling states, the threads executed by the microengines maintain thread capability information and port-to-thread assignments; and
>
> in event of a processing exception concerning a particular received packet, sending the particular received packet to a processor core for further processing by the processor core, functionality of the threads executed by the microengines being determined by microcode loaded via the processor core into the microengines. (New independent claim 61).

The other currently pending independent claim (i.e., new claim 69) contains the above underlined limitations of independent claim 61, or similar limitations. Thus, all of the currently pending claims contain the above underlined limitations of claim 61, or similar limitations, either directly, or by depending from one of the independent claims. 35 USC §112, fourth paragraph.

Although the limitations in the claims are not limited to or bound by embodiments disclosed in the Specification, in an embodiment disclosed in the Specification, these features of the claimed invention that are not disclosed or suggested in the documents relied upon by the Examiner permit this embodiment to operate in a manner that is different from, and to achieve advantages that cannot be achieved by, the technology disclosed in these documents. (See, e.g., Specification, page 7, line 16 to page 12, line 21). Accordingly, since these advantageous features of the claimed invention are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the documents relied upon by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that these documents, whether taken singly or in combination, do not render obvious the claimed invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that rejection of the newly added claims under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Allison and Belkin is not warranted.

In the event that the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to initiate an interview.

In the event that any fees are due or payable in connection with this submission or in this application (including any applicable extension of time for response fees) please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-4238. Likewise, please credit any overcharges to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 26, 2011

/Christopher K. Gagne, Reg. No. 36,142/
Christopher K. Gagne
Attorney For Assignee
Reg. No. 36,142
Telephone No. (817) 281-7131